Dup

FELLOWSHIP

March, 1945 — Vol. XI—No. 3

THIS MONTH:

India's Nation-Building Program

By RALPH RICHARD KEITHAHN

We Do Sit Down

"Pacifist!
Do you mean to say
You'd have us sit down
And let Hitler —"
Etcetera.

"Well—
We sit down and
let Poverty;
We sit down to
Race Prejudice;
Sit down to Child Labor;
Take War on our lap
And cuddle him."

SARAH CLEGHORN

I Shall Stand Fast

By HENRI ROSER

•

Three Men at Crimea

By A. J. MUSTE

•

Experiment in Conscription

By GEORGE BAIRD

•

How Conscription Was Defeated in 1920

By GLENN D. EVERETT

15 cents a copy

$1.50 a year

John Haynes Holmes

I

SOCRATES. The President insists upon "unconditional surrender."

THRASYMACHUS. So we are told, Socrates.

S. But what does he mean by "unconditional surrender"?

T. Why, that is obvious enough. He means surrender without conditions.

S. But that *is* a condition, isn't it? He will cease fighting and announce an armistice *on condition* that the enemy surrender without conditions.

T. You are right, Socrates. That *is* a condition.

S. So there is no such thing as "unconditional surrender." The President is simply talking—using words without meaning—when he announces this condition for ending the war.

II

THRASYMACHUS. But I think the President has an idea.

SOCRATES. Has he?

T. Yes! It is the idea that the enemy must surrender without being granted terms.

S. Terms? What do you mean, Thrasymachus, by terms?

T. Why, the conditions under which the war will be ended. What will be done to the people, the territory, the government, and so on.

S. Oh, then we are back at the same point again. There *are* conditions!

T. Yes, Socrates, of course there are. There must be some terms, or conditions, under which the enemy will be allowed to live after the war. But the enemy will be told these conditions only when they have surrendered, and not before.

S. So "unconditional surrender" does not mean unconditional surrender at all. It means surrender under conditions known only to the victors.

T. Yes, Socrates, that is true.

S. So, again, there is no such thing as "unconditional surrender."

III

THRASYMACHUS. But the phrase isn't important, Socrates. The point is, we are not going to allow the enemy to dictate to us the terms under which he will surrender.

SOCRATES. Good! We are going to dictate terms to *him.*

T. Exactly!

S. Then why not dictate them? Why not say right now—here are the terms, the conditions, under which we are willing to end this war?

T. So that's what you want!—to end this war without victory? You want peace now. . . .

S. Don't we all want peace now if we can get it?

T. Yes, but we must defeat the enemy first!

S. But aren't we defeating the enemy when we persuade him to lay down his arms, and cease fighting? The trouble with this "unconditional surrender" business is that it indefinitely prolongs the war and thus needlessly sacrifices thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of precious lives. For the enemy will never surrender while he is ignorant of what punishment may await him. Not knowing the best that we may concede, he fears the worst that he can imagine. Remembering what he has done to others, he believes the same will be done to himself. So the war goes on, and will go on as long as the enemy can stand erect upon his feet.

T. And you would offer terms?

S. Certainly! Terms consistent with our own honor and dignity, and with the principles of an enduring peace—and then I would say, Take these, and the moment you take them we will fight no more, the war will end, and we will begin the building of a new world, which will be yours as well as ours.

T. And you think the enemy would yield?

S. Not instantly, perhaps! But very much sooner than under the policy of "unconditional surrender." Goebbels' propaganda would continue its wicked work. But there all the time would stand the open door of escape from hell. A soldier would throw down his rifle here, a regiment would revolt there, the submarine crews would desert ship, cities and villages would break out into revolution. The enemy would go to pieces, in the sheer desire to get through that open door. But so long as the door remains closed, they will beat themselves to pieces against it.

T. They will fight to the bitter end.

S. Yes—to the bitter end. Ours, as well as theirs!

IV

THRASYMACHUS. It's pretty sad business, isn't it, Socrates?

SOCRATES. War is always sad business—and tragic business. Primarily because it creates, necessarily, the conditions of its own failure.

T. Conditions again!

S. Yes, conditions. Imagine talking about anything unconditioned, or "unconditional," in war or peace. Everything is conditioned by what the fighting does. In the world without, the conditions are destruction, starvation, disease, economic ruin, and death. In the world within, the conditions are fear, lust, hate, revenge, and nameless passion. These are the conditions under which we have to make peace after war. And it can't be done! The President is talking therefore about sheer moonshine when he speaks of "surrender," or anything else, apart from conditions. By merely going to war we have bound ourselves by conditions like iron fetters upon the limbs of a swimmer. There is only one way to get rid of these conditions which are dragging us to our doom, and that is to end the war.

T. Which means taking on new conditions!

S. Yes! Conditions of peace and brotherhood. You see, Thrasymachus, there is no such thing in life as escaping conditions. We must live under the conditions imposed by war, which is our present dreadful lot, or we must live under conditions imposed by peace, which is our future dream. The conditions of peace, in the very nature of things, are the antithesis of war. Therefore must we end everything that has to do with war. Peace will come when men are ready even to love their enemies for the sake of peace.

T. Perhaps that's the only way to conquer our enemies. By love!

S. Exactly.

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway
New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

J. ELLIOTT FINLAY
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., and at the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

March, 1945 — Vol. XI—No. 3

I Shall Stand Fast*

By HENRI ROSER

Translated from the French by Edith Lovejoy Pierce

I AM SEATED IN A TRAIN somewhere in Holland. Evening falls, dusk seeps through the window into our compartment and blurs all outlines. No lights are lit, for it is wartime. I close my book and try to study the faces of my travelling companions. Opposite me sits a woman with black hair. A Jewess perhaps? No, Jews are not allowed to use public conveyances. Yet she looks sad enough. She is dressed entirely in black. No doubt she wears mourning for some loved one, a war victim perhaps, killed in an air raid or condemned to death for some misdemeanor. . . . The woman stares straight ahead without moving. As though she wanted to show that she would confide in no one the sorrowful secret of her soul, she keeps her lips tightly closed.

Her neighbor is a gentleman of mature years. Wearily he lets his hands hang between his knees, and considers them with downcast eyes. He is thin, as everyone in this compartment is thin. Only once he lifts his head, and that is when for a few moments the sea becomes visible from the train. A light in his eyes, he stares at the vast stretch of water. Is he a sailor? His frail body would deny it, but no one can tell these days. . . . He might have been big and sturdy once. On his left hand I seem to distinguish a blue mark, a tattoo. But perhaps he stares at the sea with such intensity only because it parts him from the son who, somewhere on the other shore, is now under arms, or else because he has a son in the navy, or relatives in the Indies, as almost all Dutchmen have.

Beside me sits a man who is plainly dressed, a workman perhaps. He is silent, like the others. Although the words are not written on the windows, everyone knows for sure: "The enemy is listening." He too stares out through the window, fixedly and without moving. Do the fields grieve him? The fields that were once meadows and beds of tulips, and that the plow has now transformed into acres of beets?

Nobody speaks. Only the caressing monotony of the wheels breaks the silence. The impression seizes me that with the coming of dusk, along with the rhythm of the wheels, thousands of shapes, thousands of thoughts, come fluttering supernaturally into the compartment. A few days ago new executions took place. Is it the *hodie mihi, cras tibi* that makes all creatures so sad and silent? Is it the effect of my own mood, or is the thought borne in upon me by my surroundings, that here I breathe in an atmosphere of almost unbearable tension? One of those who, with teeth clenched in the stillness, is mutely absorbed in far-away thoughts, will he not with a cry release his cares, his grief, his despair?

Crossing a bridge, the noise of the train turns to thunder. When the bridge is passed the muted sound of the wheels becomes almost as imperious as silence. In the compartment near me someone clears his throat. I wait. Will some voice at last break this uneasy silence? Yes, in truth. Suddenly I freeze, irresistible tears fill my eyes. A voice, tired and old, starts to sing. An old Dutch chant, a church hymn, which speaks of the unwearying care of God for men. The aged voice—is it old or does it merely tremble because of tears withheld?—threatens to lose itself in the noise of the train's wheels. But here is a second voice that comes to its help, then a third, a woman's this time. I see that my neighbor across the aisle has joined in, in her turn, and also the sailor, who has now straightened himself up and leans his head back against the partition. Then next my neighbor the workman. Now it is quite dark in the train, and only the singing faces glow with the last light.

The train continues its uproar through the countryside. In it men sing, hearts sing, and their song is proud and sad, humble and pious.

All of a sudden I understand these men, the Dutchmen, "so calm," better than ever before. I understand whence comes their strength to persevere, to stand fast, a strength that no human power can ever drain dry.

* Composed in 1941 and first published in a Swiss journal. Roser was former Secretary of the F.O.R. in France, and he faithfully ministered to his congregation in Paris throughout the German occupation. Today he serves two Paris churches and a camp of prisoners.

The "peace-loving nations" might learn a thing or two from

India's Nation-building Program

By RALPH RICHARD KEITHAHN

AFTER SPENDING FIVE YEARS with the American Madura Mission in India and another ten years working in close co-operation with India's own national, constructive organizations, I am deeply convinced that India today is the strongest potential influence for co-operative, creative peace in our war-dominated world. As the United States and her allies look forward to a just and durable peace, it is of fundamental importance that they help to release to the world the contribution of 400 millions of people who represent the oldest and perhaps the most pacific culture and civilization of the world.

Gandhi Still the Leader

The accepted leader of this great concentration of effective non-violence is Mahatma Gandhi. Here is one, born in a home and caste of privilege, trained in the best that India and the West could give him at the time, who has returned to his people, identifying himself completely with the needy and unprivileged. He has put on the loin cloth of the Indian villagers, who make up nearly 90 per cent of the population, and has been the inspirer and organizer of perhaps the most constructive and vital program of nation-building that exists today. He is the inheritor of the great non-violent traditions of the Buddha and the Christ. He has given his life to the practical application of the great principles of Selfless Love and Truth to modern everyday problems.

Some of Gandhi's best friends and most loyal co-workers are British, such as Mirabai (Miss Slade) and the late Charlie Andrews. His only daughter is an adopted Harijan (Untouchable). He brands as godless, and consistently refuses to enter those Temples that do not admit the Untouchables. His co-workers are from all groups. Perhaps the most vigorous follower of Ghandi is Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the leader of the "Red-shirts" (non-violent Muslims) of the northwest frontier. It is a miracle that these warlike tribes of the frontier, always a problem to British law and order, have left their swords for the Spirit, and during these days of war are standing aloof so that they may not be an embarrassment to the British while the latter are fighting their battle against Japan.

When American friends ask me whether Gandhi is not losing his influence, I can but smile at such evidence of the effectiveness of British Government propaganda in this country. Without doubt Gandhi is more loved today by his people than ever before. It is almost pitiable at times to see the complete trust the people have in their chosen leader. They often expect him to do the impossible. They place almost inhuman burdens on his weak, tired, and elderly shoulders. And when some goodhearted soul in America, as did one such the other evening, tries to get me to admit that Gandhi has lowered himself to the level of a mere political worker, I can again say that propaganda is finding its victims. There is no one in India who gives more to constructive nation-building work than does Gandhi, yet for many years Gandhi has not even been a member of the National Congress. Political leaders and practical workers always go to him for guidance, and in every crisis the nation always places the leadership in his unfailing hands. But to insinuate that Gandhi fasts merely to "blackmail the British" is to warp spiritual realities into the forms of our own secular and selfish thinking.

A year ago, when Gandhi fasted for twenty-one days, it was primarily a time of national purification. I am sure Gandhi had that very much in mind. The nation had fallen into a terrible state of frustration and bitterness. Many were beginning to use the war as a means to build up their own personal fortunes. Of course, the famine conditions weighed heavily on Gandhi's heart, and also the political impasse resulting in an irresponsible Government which could never satisfactorily care for India's tremendous needs and yet refused to make any changes "for the duration." I am sure Gandhi also had this in mind and hoped that the "enemy" would change his heart. But to call this "blackmail," as did so many Westerners, was nigh blasphemy. The positive results of the fast in India itself show how necessary was such selfless action on the part of the leader of the country. And the widespread influence of his fast shows how strong Gandhi still is as a leader of the highest destinies of a people not accustomed, as we are in the West, to separating life's activities into water-tight compartments.

Has Gandhi Accomplished Anything?

The question is often raised, even in India itself, whether Gandhi has accomplished anything substantial during his years of leadership. But when we look at his challenging "experiment with Truth"—his great movement of non-violence in India during the past twenty-five years—there can be no doubt that he has given a most precious gift not only unto his motherland but also unto all humanity.

It has been most interesting for me to see the "slavish mentality" of the Indian rapidly disappear during these years. I remember Sherwood Eddy remarked about that fact when he was in India in 1929. We were together in the home of Bishop V. S. Azariah, that great Indian Christian of South India. Eddy said, "It is remarkable how India has gotten rid of its slavish mentality. I find it now only in South India." I can assure him that it has left the shores of South India also during recent years.

Again, Indians are beginning to love and understand their country although they have to suffer dearly for it. They are beginning to see what good there is to be conserved as they rebuild their nation. And they are able to distinguish between the good and the bad that comes from the West.

A part of this steady growth of self-respect in a great nation that had dropped into the depths of despair results from the spread of the ideal of loving service in India's villages and slums, so largely inspired by Gandhi's own

noble and selfless example. I can take the reader from one end of India to the other and spend months with these individuals and homes and small groups which, inspired by Gandhi's leadership, have given themselves in selfless service to the great needs of the ordinary men and women of India. I doubt whether there is any other place in the world where we can find such an universal group of workers, knit together by love of country, serving unselfishly in a unified national program that endangers no other group or nation. The existence of such a group has tremendous possibilities for world peace, and gives the people of India a great sense of destiny in humanity's struggle for the "Co-operative Commonwealth."

Building for Unity and Strength

The All-India Spinners Association and the All-India Village Industries Association are building the new Village Republic of India. Here is economic revolution profound and non-violent. For when I spend a rupee (sixteen annas) for home-spun and woven cloth in India, I know that fifteen annas have gone to the workers and only one anna has been used in distribution. Yet in the capitalistic, profit-making order that exists also in India only seven annas out of the rupee go to the worker. Again, capitalistic economy tempts the villager to grow money-crops when he now has only enough food for two meals a day. But the AIVIA encourages the villager to grow food crops and to process them himself so as to conserve food values. It also encourages the villager to sprout pulses and grains for food purposes. By this process the protective food values may be increased as much as seven times. This is most important to the villager who faces slow starvation. This AIVIA program works toward the self-sufficiency of the villages and thus toward true democracy.

There are other organizations which build for national unity, such as the Harijan Seva Sangh (the organization which serves the Untouchable). And the Untouchables are rapidly becoming touchable and are taking a worthy place in the national life. The Hindustani Sangha is working for a national language, and every day finds more who can speak in a common tongue. Many are working for Hindu-Muslim unity, and none more than Gandhi himself. And at the root of all this is a growing respect for all faiths and creeds in a land known as the mother of religions.

This nation-building program is comprehensive, it is realistic, it is non-violent. Thousands are giving full time to its development in their own selfless and loyal way, in spite of the fact that they receive little encouragement from the British Government. I should also mention the Hindustani Talimi Sangha, a system of national education based upon the fundamental activities of the village itself. This has now been reformulated in the Sargent scheme of education, proposed for all India as soon as the war is over. So here is a series of organizations that face realistically all of India's needs. They are building for substantial democracy, for a nation that respects all cultures, religions, and ways of life, a nation self-sufficient and thus never desirous of exploiting other countries and cultures. There is no more creative and potential basis for peace in all the world.

Britain, the War, and the Peace

This is not India's war! War was declared for India on the part of the British Government without consulting even one of the eleven autonomous provinces! These eleven provinces, with their own elected Indian ministries, were doing a good job, as was testified by all the British governors. Yet war was declared without any consideration of them. Naturally India did not feel that it was her war.

It is to the credit of Britain that Sir Stafford Cripps was sent to India to seek a settlement—a mode of co-operation. Until the last moment India had great faith in that mission. But now it is a common feeling in India, though perhaps unwarranted, that Whitehall stabbed Cripps in the back and that what was promised was withdrawn at the last moment, as a result of pressure on the part of the Viceroy and British civil service in India. That seemed the only explanation of the sudden withdrawal of Cripps when settlement seemed almost complete. Whatever may be the truth, and no one seems to know, the people of India came to feel that Britain does not intend to keep her promises and that the Atlantic Charter is mere camouflage, at least so far as the East is concerned.

This is most tragic, for I sincerely believe that it is urgent to build a bridge of good will between East and West, and that Britain and India must lay the foundations. Britain has done much that is good for India. Some of the most beloved workers in India today are British. I think of Dr. E. Forester Paton and Bishop H. Pakenham Walsh. But the present stupid, imperialistic policy of Britain tends to negate all the good that Britain or any Britisher has ever done or is doing for this great country.

I believe it is highly urgent that the United States should use its influence to win for India the right to declare through her own elected representatives whether or not she wants to participate in this war and, if so, how. If she so desires, she should be permitted to show the world how conflicts between nations may be settled by non-violent means. Certainly India's voluntary co-operation will be needed in the post-war period if we are to build a world of peace and justice. Even now India ought to be represented at all conferences that meet to consider the necessary structures of world peace. The tasks ahead are tremendous and will prove practically impossible of accomplishment unless this great people is allowed and encouraged to make a voluntary and constructive contribution.

Challenge to America

But America has much to learn from India! As I return to this country after ten years I am overwhelmed by the growth of paganism that has taken place. The churches seem only a chaplaincy to this secular, warlike civilization; and though I am deeply stirred by the witness of our conscientious objectors, it is not enough merely to oppose war. We should be working together in creative fellowship on some constructive national program for the realization of true community. And we should not wait until after the war to begin.

I hesitate to say what such a program should be, having been out of the country for so many years. But, at the request of the editors, I will suggest some points that should be considered:

1. Our economic order must be adjusted so as to make human values always supreme.

2. Our educational system must be reorganized with a definitely spiritual basis.

(Continued on page 46)

THE "SLOW-DOWN" AT LAPINE WAS NOT A STRIKE. ONE WHO PARTICIPATED IN IT EXPLAINS THE PURPOSES AND RESULTS OF THIS

Experiment in Conscription

By GEORGE BAIRD

[*EDITOR'S NOTE: Recent nation-wide publicity about the failure of a number of men in the government-operated CPS camp at Germfask, Michigan, to do any productive work makes especially timely this article describing a laboratory test of the conscription system that was conducted by a group of conscientious objectors at another government camp, at Lapine, Oregon, last spring. The author is now at Germfask, but his story is that of his experience at Lapine and it throws a new light on conditions in both camps—conditions that have been widely misrepresented in magazines and newspapers.*

The Lapine experiment involved no sabotage or destruction of property. The men did not refuse to work; they merely demanded specific, detailed instructions concerning every step in the work they were given to do. They refused to take any responsibility, assume any initiative, or make any decisions regarding the work. They accepted the basic assumptions of conscription—that they were no longer voluntary workers but were to do only what they were told. As a result, very little was done, for the foremen found it practically impossible to supervise and direct the detailed acts of every man every minute of the day. And to date the government has found no solution for this problem of making men work at tasks they consider useless.]

THE LAPINE EPISODE was a demonstration, not a slow-down or a strike; it was an exemplification in practice of the ideology known as conscription. We took the conscriptor at his word, we reacted as honestly and exactly as we could to the stimuli given, and to our satisfaction at least, substantiated our thesis that conscription itself, unalloyed and ungarnished, is completely destructive and adds nothing to human welfare.

To be perfectly fair, it must be stated that at first, because of its force and novelty, there were some who looked upon this demonstration as a possible method by which the CPS program could be brought to a standstill. Some still employ this method as a powerful reminder to those who, for one reason or another, refuse to see the situation for what it really is. But on the whole it was soon realized that such a program could be effective only if Selective Service were honestly interested in "work of national importance." This apparently is not the case and thus such a demonstration accomplishes little, aside from its educational value, in gaining our objective—the elimination of the elements of coercion and internment.

Conscription can be defined in many ways, and there have been many attempts to whitewash its more distasteful aspects. But conscription in its present usage is something laden with almost terrifying implications. It has come to mean not only the drafting of men for military service but, in addition, the drafting of men for common labor service. It is the act of harnessing the productive power of human beings and forcing them to work at jobs assigned them, in many cases without regard to their physical or mental fitness, and always without just compensation. And the fact must not be overlooked that such extortion of human services is always dependent upon violence or the threat of violence for its accomplishment. If it is voluntary it is not conscription; if it is conscription it cannot be voluntary.

The implications behind the act of conscription, when stripped to barest essentials, are these: "I the conscriptor am wiser than you. I know what is good and what is good for you. I am the authority and all decisions rest on me. I will decide where you shall work, what you shall do, where you shall live, what you should eat, and what you should learn. It is not for you to think of these things, for I know best. Yours is merely to obey and be grateful to me on a liberal percentage basis. In short, I'll do the thinking for all of you, and for that you must pay me a fitting tribute."

At Lapine some of us merely took the conscriptor at his word and let him do the thinking. A very little imagination will show that the experiment was devastating to the work production. Never once was there any disobedience, but the foremen were pressed for every decision and they soon saw that the situation was utterly hopeless. Without our help—voluntary help—they were powerless to make us produce to any consequential degree. Yes, they could have punished us. They could have taken away our freedom to a greater and greater degree. It is logical to assume that they could have employed violence upon us if they were willing to go outside the law, but even they must have realized that violence does not produce intelligence—and intelligence is necessary for production. Their answer was to ship us to another camp.

This was an experiment, a demonstration. It was nothing new or revolutionary. It has been thought out and worked over in other camps before. Individuals had tried it, and it is well known that in the Army the man who just can't be handled is the one who plays dumb. Judging from all reports, there are many such. Perhaps the reason why Lapine has earned so much notoriety from this experiment is that there it was carried a little farther than had been done previously and because some of the men tried so earnestly to learn every possible lesson from what they were doing. These men felt at the time that the most substantial contribution that could be made toward the solution of this conscription riddle was to find out if possible exactly what this ideology is—why it seems to work on some and not on others, and whether it is really conscription itself that makes men work, or something else altogether.

Perhaps the most important single discovery that was made was the fact that most of the men who took part in

the demonstration found it to be about the most difficult task they had ever attempted. The whole portrayal was completely foreign to their natures and it necessitated a constant and vigilant effort to keep up the part. This lesson was learned and learned well, that man is by nature a producer, a creator, and a chooser. This fact necessarily follows, that one of the strongest reasons why conscription *seems* to work is because of the nature of man and not because of the validity of the system. Man cannot help creating because he *is* man. Conscription seems to work because it imprisons the bodies, steals the product, and plays on the credulity of its victims. It adds nothing, aids nothing, but merely attaches itself as a parasite and lives on the natural productivity of the human being.

Throughout the history of CPS a sizable number of men have been called malcontents, radicals, saboteurs, or just plain lazy. Using such names on the men who don't fit into the system has been easy and in most cases has brought the desired result, but in studying the cases more carefully we have felt that these analyses were not only inaccurate, but showed the lack of even a pretense of a desire to help the situation. Men act the way they do because of certain reasons. Men work or don't work because of the presence or absence of certain stimuli, and to call a man lazy when he fails to respond to a stimulus that for him simply isn't there, is merely to avoid the issue. He may or may not be lazy, but in this particular situation his behavior is normal. Several of us at Lapine made it our job to try to find these stimuli, to find out why this man went out and worked like a truck horse all day and the one next to him did only what he was driven to do; why another man would do excellent work at some tasks, and practically nothing at others. We knew that many of these CPS "trouble-makers" had been exceptionally hard workers before coming into the system. Most were skilled in some line, and practically all of them had been successfully making their own way in the world prior to this time. It was only under conscription that they reacted in this way. We asked ourselves, if conscription really works, if there is something good about it, why doesn't it work on these men? If it doesn't work on these men, why does it work on so many others?

Summing up many weeks of analysis and observation, we came to some more or less general conclusions as to the nature of man and the nature of the conditions and forces that stimulate him to work. Because we considered these conclusions to be of great value to us in our dealing with this fast growing problem, we think it important that they be briefly set forth here for the consideration of others working along the same line.

Since our prime consideration was that of conscription, the authority that assumes the right to tell men where and at what tasks they shall work, we started from that point, and attempted to determine the principal natural forces that induce men to expend their energy along certain lines. The first of these stimuli is that of natural inclination or interest in the work. Any man works hardest on the job that most interests him or seems to him most worth while. He not only works hard but, because it is a voluntary effort, he brings into play all of the creative and inventive faculties of the human mind. Here is the secret of the true progress of humanity. And here also is the explanation of a great deal of the worth-while effort in CPS. It is evident to anyone who has been in the system for any length of time that many of the men are vitally interested in the projects, in special tasks within the projects, or in the administration of the system. These men need no other stimulus to make them work. They have the prime one. It is also evident that a great deal of the extra-curricular activity of the men is motivated by this same cause, and much of the really important work of CPS falls in this category. As stated before, many of the "laziest" men on project put in long and tedious hours at night on work that to them has some importance. But the project work lacks that stimulus for them. To expect them to "volunteer" is, to say the least, unreasonable. Their negative reaction is perfectly natural.

The second stimulus on our list can be called, broadly, wages. Men will work at a task that is not particularly to their liking, or even very distasteful to them, if in return they receive a wage with which they can purchase the things they need and like. Under the heading of wages may fall money, property, favor, privilege, service, protection, or even the satisfaction of fulfilling a duty to a master. One striking thing about this stimulus of wages is the fact that in itself it can produce nothing new. You cannot purchase something which is not yet in existence. The barter stimulus perpetuates, but does not create. It is important, however, to point out here that in most instances the two stimuli, natural inclination and wages, occur together in combination and it is difficult to avoid confusing their results. Wages alone can deal only with that which is static and already defined. The employer can purchase only those abilities which have been previously demonstrated. Any growth, any progress, must fall outside that definition and come under the heading of voluntary effort.

It is well known that in CPS there are no wages in the form of money or property, but nevertheless, wages play an important part in stimulating men to work in the system at tasks they do not like and for which they are not well fitted. Many men feel that they owe a service to their government, and this form of service is acceptable to them. Others feel that the privilege of remaining out of combat duty or related work is wage enough to demand any service they can render. Still others may work for fame or glory, or for special favor or privilege within the system. It is certain that a great number of men in CPS are responding because they are receiving a wage in some form. But what of those who consider the support of this system a genuine disservice to the nation, who feel that the purchase of a privilege is nothing but a crime made respectable, and who are not interested in fame or glory or special favors? Have we the right to say that they are "non-conformists" or "crack-pots" when they react as any normal human being would when he is not offered a wage for his labor?

The only other stimulus, and we are not entirely sure that it can be classed as such, is force. Under this heading come all the forms of violence and coercion, and the threat of these, which accompany conscription. Whether force alone can stimulate production is still an open question to us. There have been times when we considered conscription as a legitimate motivating power, even though we were aware that it could bring forth only the lowest form of human output. But when we bear in mind that conscription never appears alone, that even though there may be no wages there is always present the innate productivity of man, then we realize that conscription adds

(Continued on page 46)

How Conscription Was Defeated in 1920

By GLENN D. EVERETT*

THE PRESENT CAMPAIGN for peacetime conscription recalls the similar campaign at the close of the first World War. Had it not been for a vocal popular opposition aroused by certain religious and pacifist groups, America might have been harnessed with a system of compulsory militarism 25 years ago. The lessons of history, in any event, are always profitable to observe and should not be ignored in the present crisis.

The author of the 1920 bill was the same man who is energetically pushing for the adoption of a similar measure today, Representative (then Senator) James W. Wadsworth of New York. A previous attempt had been made in 1916, before America entered the war, to enact peacetime conscription. A wartime draft act was adopted in June, 1917, but it ceased to operate after the Armistice.

In July, 1919, an "omnibus" bill to reorganize the Army was introduced, and Section 51 of this bill called for the compulsory training of all youths at the age of 19 for three months. The bill was introduced by the chairmen of the Senate and House committees on military affairs, Senator Wadsworth and Representative Kahn (Dem.-Cal.). Senator Chamberlain (Dem.-Ore.), author of the 1916 training bill, introduced a measure calling for six months' training.

Chairman Wadsworth pressed for immediate action and hearings on Reorganization of the Army opened on August 7, 1919. Only two lonesome witnesses appeared during the entire three-month proceedings to testify against permanent conscription. They were Jesse Edgerton of Damascus, O., and Joseph C. Stratton of Winona, O., who were sent by the Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends to urge defeat of the provision. No sooner was Mr. Edgerton introduced than Sen. Chamberlain began to badger him intemperately as to whether he were a conscientious objector and, if so, why? The hour was already late and the two witnesses had practically no opportunity to express their views on the proposed legislation.

Two witnesses who were called during consideration of the National Guard provisions of the omnibus bill opposed compulsory training, arguing that expansion of existing Guard organizations would be better.

The remainder of the two thousand pages of testimony gives a good indication of the arguments that were made in favor of the suggested training. High-ranking Army officers naturally made up the majority of the witnesses on the overall subject of reorganization of the Army, and to hear the generals talk—if one may be permitted the observation—the training was not at all designed to instruct young men in the art of killing, but was to be a magnificent character-building enterprise.

The testimony of the military men carried the Committee's opinion, and compulsory military training was endorsed, the period being lengthened to four months as a compromise between Sen. Chamberlain's six months and Sen. Wadsworth's three months. The boys, upon completion of their training, were to be placed in organized reserves, on a local basis, for five years and called back for two summer "refresher" courses. It was proposed to train somewhat in excess of 600,000 boys a year.

A vigorously dissenting minority report was submitted by Senators McKellar (Dem.-Tenn.) and Sheppard (Dem.-Tex.). They objected to peacetime conscription,

> ". . . Because it provides for compulsory universal military training at an enormous expense to the taxpayers of the United States when we have at least four million young men in the country already well-trained and ready for any emergency for many years to come. Whatever the merits of compulsory universal military training, there is no necessity for putting it into force now when the nation is laboring under such a load of debt, and when we have an ample number of well-trained soldiers immediately available. Even the advocates of the system ought not insist upon it now. They ought to be willing to postpone it for a few years."

Though the item of cost bulked large in the Senators' view, so did the aspects of militarism. "If it is a bad thing for Germany to have universal military training—and we say so in our treaty—how does it happen that it is a good thing for free America to have it now?" asked Senator McKellar. On April 7, 1920, the real debate began. Senator Marcus Smith of Arizona, Senator Pomerene of Ohio, Senator Kirby of Arkansas, and others hammered home objections very similar to those which are brought forward against the May bill today.

However, the chief reason for the defeat of the conscription plan was the *behind-the-scenes pressure of citizens who were opposed to military training* and who let their Congressmen know it. As this popular opposition began to be reflected in the temper of the Senate, proponents of the measure hedged rapidly. Senator Frelinghuysen (Rep. N. J.), an ardent advocate of conscription admitted that "there are so many Senators opposed to the compulsory feature, feeling that the sentiment of the country is against it, and that it is unwise to adopt it, that they will vote against" this bill. Near the end of the first full day of debate, Senator Wadsworth proposed that the beginning of the training program be delayed from January 1, 1921, to January 1, 1922, in order "to give the War Department more time to prepare." Actually, it was the coming November elections upon which the nervous chairman's eyes were probably resting. Members who might vote in favor did not want the prospects of the imminent inauguration of conscription confronting their constituents on ballot day. But this compromise failed of its purpose. The bill was defeated.

For nearly 20 years the issue of conscription in peacetime lay dormant, untouchable. Its advocates blamed their defeat on the fact that they had brought the issue up after the war, when armed enemies had disappeared, and disillusionment about the peace had already set in. This time Mr. Wadsworth and his supporters are asking for 12 month's training, not four, for 1,000,000 boys a year, not 600,000, and for possibly 3 or 4 billion dollars annually, not 600 million. They want action now, while the war is still on, and before too many questions are asked by the people.

* Glenn Everett is a member of the editorial staff of United States News Magazine and research consultant for the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

THE WHOLE WORLD PONDERS THE WORDS OF

Three Men at Crimea

By A. J. MUSTE

THE REPORT OF THE CRIMEA CONFERENCE, following the long-awaited meeting of Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, ends with a sweeping assertion which appears to have been made in a spirit of complete self-assurance by these three men: "Victory in this war and the establishment of the proposed international organization will provide the greatest opportunity in all history to create in the years to come the essential conditions" of a secure and lasting peace which will, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

That covers a lot of ground. The fact, if it be a fact, that three men had it in their power to make decisions of such stupendous magnitude may itself give us pause. Perhaps to some extent the key to the significance of these decisions and to future developments is furnished by this concentration of power in the hands of three mortal men. However that may be, what do the contents of this Report reveal about the war, the peace, and the post-war world?

1. The shock which was felt and expressed by multitudes in the United States and elsewhere over the repudiation of the Atlantic Charter in practice, and the slightly concealed contempt characterizing recent references to it in high quarters, has registered. The Report of the Crimea Conference puts the Atlantic Charter—on paper at least—back on the throne with resounding acclaim. "By this declaration," the Report says, "we reaffirm our faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, our pledge in the Declaration by the United Nations, and our determination to build world order under law, dedicated to peace. . . ." There is no hint of the line which President Roosevelt, and alas, a good many churchmen, took recently, to the effect that the Atlantic Charter was a goal, an ideal, to shoot at but not to put into practice now. Thus for the moment, taking the Atlantic Charter seriously is not "perfectionism."

2. The attitude toward Germany remains "tough"; the peace is, for the German people, to be definitely punitive. Not only are "German militarism and nazism" to be destroyed, but the Big Three intend to "eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for war production." That certainly leaves out nothing of significance. Germany is, moreover, to compensate for war damage "in kind to the greatest extent possible." This leaves the way open for the use of German labor battalions by Russia, with no commitment as to the conditions under which such forced labor shall toil or the limits to be set for "damage" and "compensation." Ominous is the concluding sentence in this section relating to a commission which is to determine these matters: "The commission will work in Moscow."

"Unconditional surrender" is unqualifiedly reaffirmed, as is the policy that the terms implied "will not be made known until the final defeat of Germany has been accomplished"—a policy which many non-pacifists as well as pacifists regard as stupid and responsible for unnecessarily prolonging the war at the cost of the lives of many Allied soldiers.

The three powers "will each occupy a separate zone of Germany," and France will be invited to "take over a zone of occupation." It is, however, provided that there shall be "a careful control commission of the three powers with headquarters in Berlin" to co-ordinate administration and control. The facts here are that the military will be in the saddle and that troops of four powers will dominate in separate sections of Germany. This, as well as the Polish "settlement" to which we shall refer in a moment, suggests dismemberment a la the Morgenthau plan or some similar scheme. Just what "co-ordination" will mean in the long run is not clear. But probably the provisions for joint control by the military chiefs sitting in Berlin rules out for the present the setting up of a Russian puppet government under General von Paulus, a move which has been widely discussed. However, in such matters the size of the respective occupying forces and the willingness of governments to employ them is always finally decisive. Stalin will certainly not be at a disadvantage, under the circumstances, in decisions affecting the future of Germany and thus of Europe.

3. In the section of the Report on Poland there is a formula by which Churchill and Roosevelt, who have recognized the Polish Government in Exile in London and have refused to date to recognize the Moscow-created Lublin (de facto) Provisional Government of Poland, "save face," while Stalin loses nothing. The Lublin government is designated as "the present Provisional Government"! But this regime is to be "reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad," and then will be called "the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity" and all the allied powers will enter into diplomatic relations with it.

The unilateral action of Russia in annexing eastern Poland is confirmed and given status, and the stamp of approval is put upon the policy of carving up Germany, and other countries if the strategic or other supposed needs of big powers so dictate, by the declaration that "Poland must receive substantial accessions of territory in the north and west." Just like that! This can only mean territory which from an ethnical or historical viewpoint has never been Polish.

4. A conference of the United Nations is to be called in San Francisco on April 25, 1945, to take definite steps to establish the "security organization" projected in Dumbarton Oaks. It will be recalled that crucial questions relating to voting procedure in the Dumbarton Oaks security council were left undecided because Russia contended that any one of the big powers should be permitted to vote

in a case involving itself, i. e., should have veto power over the use of any international sanctions. The Crimea Report said that this difficulty has been resolved but that the solution would not be revealed until France and China had been consulted about the call for the San Francisco Conference. Within a day or two after the publication of the Crimea Conference Report, however, the "compromise" was announced. No nation will have power to veto moves to bring against it in the Security Council the charge that it is acting as an aggressor, or to veto "non-punitive" measures. The big powers retain, however, the crucial and decisive right to veto the imposition of any punitive action, any real sanctions whether economic or military, against themselves. Moreover, there is not the slightest specific hint that Dumbarton Oaks is to be modified materially at any of the other points which the Cleveland conference of churchmen and many others have criticized, such as the domination of the organization by the Security Council which is in turn dominated by the Big Three. Crimea gives us no valid reason for altering the judgment that Dumbarton Oaks as it stands is "the perpetuation and ratification of an existing power structure."

We have pointed out that the resentment and grief expressed by a great many people over the repudiation of the Atlantic Charter and the unashamed playing of power politics in recent months led the Crimea Conference to pay eloquent homage to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We should take the hint. This is not the moment, especially not for churchmen, to take counsel of their fears and cry, "It is Dumbarton Oaks or nothing." Rather let us take counsel of our faith and arouse a great hope in the hearts of men by proclaiming, "We will not be a party to foisting an illusion on the war-weary masses of men. We can support Dumbarton Oaks only if it is so modified that it ceases to be a camouflaged power pact and becomes, at least in embryo, a genuine world organization."

But the Crimea Report now makes it imperative that churchmen and all who are genuinely interested in peace attach another condition to support of the Dumbarton Oaks plan. Support should be absolutely withheld unless Big Three repudiate their monstrous attempt at Crimea to legalize the carving up of Poland and Germany, their unilateral actions against the little nations, and their proposed regime of military occupation, industrial crippling, and virtual slavery for the German people. As it is now, Dumbarton Oaks is inextricably tied up with these policies. Endorsing Dumbarton Oaks means endorsing them. In effect it means that the United States accepts the obligation to guarantee all these decisions and to use armed force and the lives of its young men to implement that guarantee. The Dumbarton Oaks security organization will be used for this purpose as the League of Nations was used as an instrument to enforce the Versailles Treaty and a dictated peace. This is a sure road to war. If the American people understand the facts, they will have none of this.

5. Finally, the fact that this conference of Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin resulted in an agreement among them on a number of important points and an announcement that they expect to continue to co-operate for an indefinite period probably means that the conflicts between the great powers which have flared up repeatedly in recent months will not be permitted to break out immediately into open warfare. An effort to stabilize the relations between them and to impose a "peace" on Europe and Asia will probably be made. It will not be a genuine peace any more than that following the last war, but an armistice precariously based on a military alliance. During that armistice, there will be widespread disillusionment. Men will reflect, think. Even as we go about the tasks of the present moment and seek to influence current developments as we may, let us pray that our Fellowship may be given grace and wisdom "to speak to the condition of men" in those post-war years in the hope that they may not again prove to be pre-war years.

India's Nation-Building Program

(Continued from page 41)

3. Our social structure must be reformed on the basis of racial justice and brotherhood.

4. Our rural areas must be stimulated to attain new levels of abundant and creative living.

5. Our international relations must be directed toward the building of a co-operative commonwealth of the peoples of the world.

No single method or organization can possibly achieve those goals. The ministry of our churches must be revitalized, intensified, and extended. Perhaps such groups as our pacifists must establish centers for the practice and development of non-violent methods in conflict areas. In some places Christians should join in experimental groups of true community to study the principles of non-violent, creative society and to practice them together. National and international organizations may be necessary for developing various phases of the program. And perhaps the time has come for some of us to take the vows of simple living and selfless service, forming a voluntary order through which we may give ourselves completely to the task of fighting with non-violent methods the battle of the unprivileged and exploited, that true peace may come to all.

Experiment in Conscription

(Continued from page 43)

nothing, that it merely imprisons the laborer and steals the product of his labor.

Yes, conscription works. It is a powerful force and one that cannot be brushed aside. But it is not the constructive force we have been led to think it is. It is all negative. It breeds obedience and stagnation, not intelligence and growth. We at Lapine who lacked the other stimuli that kept most of the men busy on project work gave conscription a fair trial. We acted on nothing but the threat of violence, and the results were what has been called the "slow-down," and the transfer to Germfask. We didn't like it and a great many of us have refused to continue it as a program because it was too internally degrading for the small effect it was having in the right direction. But we know now what conscription is—and what it is not. We know that it can kill just as surely as a rifle bullet—but more deadly than that is the danger that in accepting it as necessary we stamp man a "commodity" and kill the mind.

A Hopi CO Questions the White Man's "Justice"

THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT of Thomas Jenkins, a Hopi Indian imprisoned for failure to report for induction under the Selective Service Act, was made before Judge Ling on April 24, 1944:

"Long before Christopher Columbus' grandmother saw the light of day, the Hopi form of government was instituted in Oraibi, now the oldest continuously inhabited village in the country, and the seat of the Hopi Empire. Oraibi is situated on one of the mesas in the northern part of what is now known as the state of Arizona.

"This original form of government is still in existence and functioning today in the Hopi land. This form of government has no judges, no army, no police force, no jails or prisons; and there are no tax collectors prying into the pockets of the people.

"Today I stand before you a prisoner of the Federal Government of the United States, my guardian and protector, charged with failure to report for induction. I find myself alone, helpless, seemingly without a friend. I have been called by some a traitor, trouble maker, agitator; and some have suspected me of being a German spy or of being engaged in subversive activity. Nevertheless, I plead not guilty, and I say it with all the sincerity of my heart.

"I plead not guilty, for the following reasons:

"1. This is my land; my home. I was born and raised here and will die here when the Great Spirit calls me. My first and last interest is here. I keep my hands out of foreign entanglements.

"2. When you white men first set foot on the eastern shores, our fellow tribesmen welcomed you. When you were hungry, they fed you. When you were cold they gave you shelter. They showed you how to plant corn and hunt in the forest. They helped build your homes. Then after you had established your form of government, your army, your prisons and jails, you dashed across the country killing, plundering, and destroying the natives and their homes; driving them before you, giving them new land one day and taking it away the next day. And if they resisted, you gave them fire-water. Today I stand before you without a land to call my own under the Government of the United States. No land; no fire-water.

"3. Ever since the Declaration of Independence in 1787 on down to the Declaration of War against the Axis in 1941, the Hopis have never participated in your governmental affairs. All the contradicting and confusing laws, from the Constitution of the United States down to the still more confusing Selective Service Act, were made by you without the consent, agreement, or knowledge of the Hopis. They have no voice, no representatives, no vote, and no rights in your governmental affairs.

"4. I have never registered under the Selective Service Act of the United States since October 16, 1940. All my Selective Service questionnaires were filled out by Colonel Duffy, who was stationed in Phoenix, with the help of Mr. Connelly, then the principal of the Hotevilla Day School, and by Mr. C. B. Meade, superintendent of the Federal Prison Camp, Tucson, Arizona. This was done against my wishes. I have already served my term for this and have therefore paid the penalty for it.

"No nation should ever force the helpless, underprivileged, undefended, and peace-loving Hopis, who have caused the people of the United States not one bit of trouble, to go to a war for which they are absolutely not responsible. It is most unfair and unjust and un-American. To do so you will be knowingly, willfully, and wrongfully destroying a group of oppressed and underprivileged people in this so-called Christian country while you are struggling to liberate the oppressed and underprivileged people in foreign countries. Their blood shall be upon you. The least you could do is to place the Hopis, and especially those who are still living on the Reservation, on a voluntary basis in this war.

"You believed in saving yourself by going to war. The Hopi believed that by adhering to his religious teaching he would obtain his salvation. You have your religion.

"Today I have driven the rod of truth into the soil of my forefathers. I have thrown the rope of your own mistakes around you and tied it to the rod, the truth. There is no escape.

"Brother, what shall it be? You make the choice!"

Psychiatrist Says War Makes Schizoids

A psychiatrist recently remarked that all people who participate directly in war are schizoid: they kill though of course the human being does not want to kill. One illustration of this divided mind and soul is the aviator who is trained to be almost superhumanly skillful in inflicting death; but so great is the concern for preserving his *own* life that he carries when forced to abandon his plane a tent, a collapsible rubber boat with mast and sail, cooking utensils, a machine that makes salt water potable, a shark-repellant, signalling flares, coloring matter for the ocean about his boat, a knife, a pistol, and a book on how to survive in all types of wilderness.

Would Revise Oaks Plan

Mexico has proposed 28 revisions of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, and nine other Latin American nations have concurred in many of the proposed changes. One of their chief objections is that the small Security Council would be the decision-making body, while the large Assembly (the only body representing the small nations) would have little or no power.

Max Josef Metzger

HE CAME TO US at one of our early international F.O.R. Council meetings in Holland, in 1920, a young Catholic priest who had heard of this international movement towards peace; and that was something after his own heart. We were having evening prayers at the time and he joined in with his beautiful voice and his beautiful soul.

For some eight or ten years we had the benefit of close contact with him on our Council. In 1923, he inaugurated a Catholic World Peace Movement. I happened to be the delegate sent, and for a memorable week I shared in its spirit—the only non-Catholic present.

Always brimming over with new plans for bringing the gospel of his Lord home to men and women today, he experimented in one direction after another. He organized a very modern Order of Brothers and Sisters—first at Graz in Austria and then at Meitingen, in Bavaria, where he carried on an institutional center for training and practical social work with special emphasis on the down-and-out and the unreclaimable.

More recently, in 1939, he sent out leaflets about the "Bruderschaft Una Sancta," a movement he had just started, centering around prayer for the unity of Christendom. These leaflets went to some thousands of Protestant pastors in Germany; and in the last letter I received from him he spoke of the warm response he had received and told of a fruitful conference held at Meitingen on Whitsuntide, 1939, when some 60 Catholics and Protestants came together and for three days were "one in Christ."

Since the war, direct communication has not been possible, though a message reached us some two years ago. We heard that he was bravely standing by one of his Brothers who had been swept into the Nazi Party and wanted to break away. We hoped for renewed contact and for the fulfillment of an oft-postponed plan to visit Meitingen. We trusted that he would have been among those used by God to draw together the two great religious communions in Germany and to advance the cause of peace. Then a month ago we heard over the radio that Monsignor Max Josef Metzger, having protested on behalf of 500 Catholic priests against some sacrilegious order in the concentration camp where he was confined, had been shot.—LILIAN STEVENSON.

Walkouts Face Trouble

Men who have walked out of CPS camps recently have found difficulty in getting employment, even with firms that need their services and would gladly hire them, because of the War Manpower Commission rule forbidding the employment of any person without a release from his former employer. The rule is enforced most strictly in areas where a critical manpower shortage exists, but may be applied anywhere. Even the wives of the walkouts are affected in some cases, for they cannot be hired on any but war jobs until they have resided in a given town or city for thirty days or more.

News from the Peace Front

Military Evades Laws on Civilian Control of Selective Service

When Congress passed legislation to establish the Selective Service system it was understood by everyone that it would be a strictly *civilian* agency with the responsibility of providing the manpower required by various branches of the armed forces. In order to insure impartiality and the utmost consideration for every man drafted, it was thought that the system should not be administered by military officials.

But *"there's not one civilian left in an executive position in the entire national headquarters organization of Selective Service,"* according to Charles Van Devander and William O. Player, Jr., in their *New York Post* column of February 13. "The Washington executive staff is now made up completely of Army and Navy officers—115 of them attached to headquarters itself, and 31 more working out of Washington with the system's regional and field services. And not only that, but there are 595 additional commissioned officers attached to the system's 52 state and territorial headquarters throughout the U. S. and its possessions." And the decisions of every local draft board are subject to review by these officials! Although the Selective Service Act also stipulates that conscientious objectors may do "work of national importance under civilian direction," Army officers have barged in here too and have taken virtual control of the "Civilian" Public Service system. The directors of the camps are civilians, but their every act is subject to the approval or disapproval of the Army-dominated Selective Service administration.

The law also reads that the President should provide for the classification of drafted men by establishing civilian appeal boards and that under certain circumstances individuals may appeal direct to the President. As a matter of fact, however, the President has delegated authority for deciding all appeals to the Director of Selective Service, who is an Army officer, and in actual practice most of these "Presidential appeals" are decided by a board of five Army officers chosen by the Director.

Court vs. Draft Board

In 1942, David Walden was denied status as a CO by his draft board, and was eventually ordered to report for induction into the armed forces. He refused, and was sentenced to five years, but was immediately put on probation on condition that he report to CPS camp #37, which he did. Later the same judge, Federal Judge Harry A. Hollzer, modified this ruling so that Walden might work for the AFSC on the west coast at the request of the Friends and on recommendation of the U. S. Probation Office. Application has now been filed at the request of Walden's local draft board for his return to the jurisdiction of Selective Service. If this were done, the draft board could send him back to CPS camp or order him into the armed forces.

Judge Hollzer has postponed his decision until March 5, pending a possible recommendation from the Department of Justice. The ACLU is working in the case on behalf of Walden, feeling that it is vital to maintain the authority of the courts to grant relief to conscientious objectors in such cases.

Opinion Poll Shows Tolerance of COs

The American public is far more tolerant of COs than it thinks it is, according to results of an opinion survey conducted by Dr. Leo P. Crespi, of Princeton University's psychology department. Actually, the majority of people are definitely friendly toward COs, according to their own statements, but most of those queried believed they were unique in this atitude.

Another significant result of the poll was the indication that three-fourths of the public thinks the government should provide wages and dependency allowances for the COs. Yet Congress consistently refuses to pass legislation to provide for these needs, on the grounds that the public will not stand for it!

Dr. Crespi is an associate of Dr. Hadley Cantril, generally considered the nation's highest authority in opinion sampling, and it is believed that the accuracy of his poll cannot be challenged. Dr. Crespi warned that the discrepancy between the public's real attitude and what it thinks its attitude is, may be damaging to COs because many people tend to be guided by what they think others believe. Unless the true average attitude is widely published, he said, it may eventually creep up to the level of intolerance where most people think it now is. Dr. Crespi is not himself a pacifist.

The complete results of this opinion poll will be published in *The Journal of Psychology* and in successive issues of the NSBRO's *Reporter* which ran its first installment in the issue of February first.

Peacetime Conscription Contest Still Serious

Though Congress has temporarily sidetracked consideration of legislation for peacetime compulsory military training, the issue is still a live one. The delay is merely a means of permitting concentration on legislation of more immediate concern—the proposed work-or-jail laws, and a nurses draft, both specifically requested by the President. Considerable opposition to these two measures has developed, and with recent improvement in the war news from both European and Pacific fronts there is doubt that Congress will pass them.

The Citizens Committee for Universal Training and Service is putting on all possible pressure to convert the country to belief in the necessity and value of peacetime conscription. The committee is run largely by Army officers and is supported strongly by big business interests, both of whom would profit by the maintenance of a huge military establishment after the war; its influential contacts throughout the country make it a force to reckon with.

One good sign for the opponents of peacetime conscription was the recent announcement of the United Auto Workers (CIO), the largest union in the world, that it will campaign actively against adoption of any such legislation before the end of the war. The Liberal Party, which supported Roosevelt in the recent election, also has issued a statement opposing any action now on peacetime military training.

Plan FOR Work Camps In South Next Summer

The Southern office of the Fellowship of Reconciliation has conducted summer work projects for six years, and now announces two for the coming summer, one in Nashville, the other in a rural area.

The city project is in a Negro section of South Nashville, where a three-story brick building is to be converted into a community center and used for community activities. The project will last from June 22 to August 20, and expenses will be about $4.50 per week for board, with an additional $5.00 for the season for sundries. Lodging will be provided.

The rural project will be in a recreational camp owned by the Mississippi State Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, where work projects have been held for the last five years. A cabin and playground equipment are to be built, a vacation church school to be conducted, a youth camp directed. Costs will be the same as for the city project, and the work will occupy the month of July.

Both groups will be interracial, and younger or older people (above high school age) are welcome. In both groups, also, a few people will be accepted for less than the full length of time. For further information write to Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tennessee.

Jottings

Death Sentence Commuted

Private Henry P. Weber, of Camp Roberts, California, recently condemned by an Army court-martial to death by hanging for refusal to join his squad at drill, has had his sentence reduced by the War Department to five years imprisonment. Private Weber is a member of the Socialist Labor Party, which rejects capitalism in any form, believes that wars are fought to maintain capitalism, and which is therefore opposed to war. He was classified 1A by his draft board because he is not a religious objector, although he had made his views known and asked for 1AO, non-combatant duty. After being sent to Camp Roberts he continued to make his views clear and refused to drill. In August a court-martial gave him six months in the guardhouse. Upon release he continued to refuse to drill, was court-martialed again, and was sentenced to be hanged.

Senator Wheeler declared, "Whoever sentenced that boy to hanging ought to be discharged from the Army," and threatened a Senate investigation. Soon the court-martial met again and commuted the sentence to life imprisonment. Then a reviewing authority reduced the sentence to 20 years, and finally the War Department reduced it to 5 years. Private Weber, who has a wife and a small child, will be dishonorably discharged from the Army, and will be deprived of any Army benefits.

The American Civil Liberties Union, at the request of Weber and the Socialist Labor Party, is entering an appeal from the five-year sentence, and is urging the office of the Judge Advocate General to annul the court-martial and reclassify Weber for non-combatant service in the Army, as has been done in the cases of various other drafted war objectors. The ACLU observes that Weber's case emphasizes again the necessity for a change in the Selective Service Act which now specifies "religious training and belief" as the only basis for conscientious objection to war, and thus denies recognition to sincere views arrived at through reason or practical experience.

Modernized Education

The Pacific International University in Los Angeles announces a modernized system of "international-cooperative-life education" different in three ways from the traditional type of college:

1. International emphasis: The Univer- had his entence reduced by the War De- world without prejudice against sex, race, color, or religion.

2. Administrative technique: Complete utilization is made of the "Cooperative System," under which the student divides his time equally between the classroom itself and the practical use in everyday life of what he learns in the classroom.

3. Academic organization: The University uses the life-situation technique instead of the departmentalized subject-matter technique, with the curriculum organized around the five basic life situations: life vocation; life avocation; family life; community life; life philosophy.

The cases of R. Boland Brooks and Jack Zucker, who challenged the right of the government to send them to labor camps without pay because of their conscientious objection to war, were decided in favor of the government last month by the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals. The court declared that the fact that the CPS camps "provide for some curtailment of the individual liberty" of the men "does not make them unlawful." The court also said that Congress has the *right* to assign all men to military duty, regardless of their conscientious objection, and that in granting them exemption Congress still reserved the right to assign alternative service and to determine the nature of that service by "its effect upon the morale of those who do serve in the armed forces."

* * *

The FOR groups in Argentina and Uruguay began publication on January 1 of a joint monthly bulletin, the first FOR organ to be published in Spanish. The editor is Dr. Daniel Lura Villanueva, Tucuman 1424, Piso 5C, Dep. C., Buenos Aires, Argentina.

* * *

The FOR has obtained a license from the Treasury Department permitting it to send money for relief to its former French Secretary, Henri Roser. He was imprisoned at the beginning of the war as a CO, but after release he returned to Paris and ministered to two churches during the German occupation. The sum of $500 from the War Victims Fund was cabled him in February to be used to aid FOR members and others. In reply Roser cabled: "Gift received. Will distribute it to best advantage. Heartfelt thanks."

* * *

A memorial window to George Lansbury by Eugene Yoors, famous Belgian artist and FOR member, will be put up in Kingsley Hall, the social settlement founded by Doris and Muriel Lester in Bow, London. Laurence Housman, chairman of the committee that is raising the funds for the window, writes: "It need not be either ambitious or costly; he would not have wished it. But it should in some way be expressive of the beauty of his life and character, and its setting should be in some place associated with his social activities, interests, and personal relations. Because he believed so keenly in the human and spiritual values of rest, recreation, beauty, and communal living, it is proposed that a stained glass window to his memory should be given to Kingsley Hall which has for many years been a social centre where all these things are given practical expression, and where he was so well known and loved."

* * *

A family on a farm in western North Carolina offers a temporary home for a CO family; the wife and children of a CPS man might be accommodated, for instance. In case of need, all or part of their transportation cost might be provided. If interested, write to A. J. Muste, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

* * *

The C. O. Demobilization Committee elected by the Northern California FOR Conference last October met in Berkeley on January 5-7 to discuss a program of cooperating with released COs and helping them to resettle and make the transition to post-war living. The three main points in the Committee's program, on which some preliminary work has already been done, are the formation of a credit union, the raising of a loan fund, and the establishment of a housing and guidance center.

* * *

A highly successful Race Relations Institute was held in Cleveland, Jan. 19-21, under the direction of George Houser and a city-wide committee. During the three days about 300 people attended the sessions. Among the speakers were Dr. Bruno Gebhard, Director of the Cleveland Health Museum; Professor Dean S. Yarborough, of Wilberforce University; A. J. Muste; and Dr. Bernard C. Clausen, of the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church, where the sessions were held. Some of the sponsors were Lawrence O. Paine, Commissioner of Paroles for the State of Ohio; Richard A. Bolt, Director of the Cleveland Child Welfare Association; C. S. Metcalf, Director of Cleveland Libraries; and Dean Leonard W. Mayo, of the School of Applied Science, Western Reserve University.

ANNOUNCING—A CONTEST

For All Young People of High School Age

"THE CASE AGAINST PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING"

First Prize for the best 750-word statement:

FREE TRIP TO WASHINGTON OR NEW YORK

Ten additional prizes for the 10 next-best statements. Write today for rules of the contest. All manuscripts must be in by May 30, 1945.

THE FORERUNNERS

2929 Broadway New York 25, N. Y.

The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

Futility of Materialism

Time Must Have a Stop, by Aldous Huxley, 311 pages. Harper and Brothers. $2.75.

Though this most recent of Huxley's novels was published some time ago, it is too important a contribution to religious and pacifist thought to omit notice of it in FELLOWSHIP. Those who are inclined to be squeamish about analysis of what goes on in the unconscious, and frank writing about it, should perhaps skip it; but for all others the book is highly important on several counts.

It is, to begin with, a fascinating and thoroughly readable story. It presents a sarcastic and devastating picture—thoroughly convincing—of what happens to human beings who lead a "worldly" life, and does it without preaching or moralizing.

One of the important characters dies and there is a description of his return to "consciousness" after that event, and the nature of that consciousness, which to me was surprisingly convincing. No one should be kept from reading it because of preconceived notions about the non-existence of "the hereafter" or disgust with what he may previously have read about occult phenomena. Incidentally, those who are interested in these matters will find an unusual and suggestive treatment of them also, based on some of the new psychology, in Philip Wylie's *Night Unto Night.*

The spiritual life, in the more conventional sense of the term, and the nature of religions are dealt with by Huxley in a way that those who have been trained in "scientific" thinking and who feel the need of deliverance from materialism and inner conflict will find helpful. "There isn't any secret formula or method. You learn to love by loving—by paying attention and doing what one thereby discovers has to be done. . . . Performing miracles in a crisis—so much easier than loving God selflessly every moment of every day! Which is why most crises arise—because people find it so hard to behave properly at ordinary times."

Finally, there is in one brief chapter especially (the twentieth) as devastating a description of war and the intellectual and spiritual setting in which modern war takes place as I have come across anywhere. The chapter begins: "Christian soldiers . . . ; and all those wars, those holy wars, while echo answers, 'whores, whores, whores!' The God of Battles is always the God of Brothels, always and inevitably." And ends: "And then the Triumph of Education. . . . Everybody went to school, and everywhere the years of schooling had been made a prelude to military conscription. . . . What a thorough grounding in the religions of nationalism! No God any more; but forty-odd infallible Foreign Offices."

A. J. M.

Prisons a Failure?

Rebel Without a Cause, by Robert M. Lindner, Ph.D. 296 pages. Grune & Stratton. $4.00.

This is an expensive book and a large part of it is devoted to a detailed report of a patient's utterances and reactions while under a treatment which Dr. Lindner calls "hypnoanalysis" and which combines the techniques of hypnotism and psychoanalysis. It is, however, not written in dry or highly technical language. I commend it as essential reading for teachers, social workers, and ministers—and parents!

Though Dr. Lindner does not say so explicitly, there is much in this book which lends support to the religious pacifist view of life and to pacifist methods for dealing with evil both in its individual and its social manifestations.

Dr. Lindner in addition to being on the faculty of Bucknell University is on the staff of the United States Public Health Service and Psychologist at the United States Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, where a considerable number of FOR members and other COs including the Managing Editor of FELLOWSHIP (on leave) reside. Very unusual interest attaches for this and other reasons to the terrific indictment of the modern prison system even in such comparatively enlightened forms as are found under the Federal Bureau of Prisons, with which he closes his meticulously dispassionate case study:

"We have had in this volume a striking illustration of the truth of William A. White's remark that behind every criminal deed lies a secret. But more important, we have glimpsed the utter futility, the sheer waste, of confining individuals in barred and turretted zoos for humans without attempting to recover such secrets. Harold's case makes a mockery of current penological pretense. It points the finger of ridicule at the sterile corridors of modern prisons, the gleaming shops and factories, the bright young social workers, the custodial hierarchy —in brief, the whole hollow structure of rehabilitation that is based upon expediency, untested hypotheses, unwarranted conclusions from a pseudo-scientific empiricism.

"In spite of the self-flattery in which criminologists, penologists and the assorted professional and warder complement of the modern prison indulge, we are not today treating criminals; and, what is worse, in only a few isolated instances are we even learning anything about them. In all its bald essence, what we are actually doing today is removing a wrong-doer from the community; and while he is in a place of detention we are submitting him unmercifully to the unrequiting ministrations of an expensive officialdom. But beyond the half-hearted employment of a "shot-gun" technique which fires its charge in all directions at once, *we do nothing fundamental about crime or the criminal.*"

A. J. M.

Post-war Boom

The Economics of Demobilization by E. Jay Howenstine, Jr. Introduction by Dr. Alvin H. Hansen; 336 pp.; American Council on Public Affairs, 2153 Florida Avenue, Washington, D. C.; cloth $3.75, paper $3.25.

The American Council on Public Affairs has published this very important study by a member of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Dr. E. Jay Howenstine, Jr., now a government economist but Professor of Economics and Chairman of the Department of Economics and Business Administration at Park College when this study was made. It should prove exceedingly valuable to all who are concerned with the problems of the post-war period and, in particular, of demobilization. It provides a thorough and authoritative survey of the economic background.

Dr. Howenstine believes that in the immediate post-war period there will be a constant pressure toward business prosperity until the backlog of demand at home and abroad has been exhausted. He believes, therefore, that a post-war boom is a practical certainty. The chief task of economic demobilization planning, as he sees it, is to control this post-war boom so as to avoid the major depression that may occur after it.

A. J. M.

Conscription

Sourcebook on Peacetime Conscription, compiled by Juliet Reeve, Fern Elizabeth Stowe, and Ada Wyman Wardlaw; and edited by Theodore Paullin. 25 cents.

This handy sourcebook contains over fifty pages of basic, thoroughly documented material dealing with the history of conscription, conscription as a military necessity, conscription and democracy, conscription and its bearing on education, health, crime, world peace and the national economy, has the kind of background material that should be brought to the attention of editors, special writers, and commentators throughout the country. If it goes through the mails as merely another piece of literature to an editor's desk, however, it is likely to end in the wastebasket. Editors will accept and welcome such a pamphlet if it is brought to their attention by a citizen of the community. This is something every FOR member can do to help fight conscription. No town is too small, no country newspaper should be neglected. The FOR will provide you with the necessary pamphlets free of charge. We can all get to work on this *now!*

Pro and Con

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

Joy in Service

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

One thing seems to me conspicuously true about my patients here at Connecticut State Hospital, and that is the absence of joy in their lives. Contagiously happy people are rare in every group, but I have seen none among those suffering from serious functional mental disease. Illogically, perhaps, this fact has stood out, for the year has forced me to reconsider the assertion, which we who have "Causes" so glibly make, that happiness rests on a *feeling* that *our* effort is effective "on the right side." Though there has been pleasure and reward in much of what I have done through various organizations, there has not been a consistent deep joy. While movements, and religious pacifism in particular, seem dotted with happy personalities, too many of my Cause-centered and even God-centered friends and fellow-workers confess to similar failure. The pleasure of working seems too often merely a relief from the dissatisfaction of thinking or hoping. Even our most auspicious efforts are often accompanied by a clenched jaw, or a firm grasp on the atmosphere, or a perch on the edge of a chair, or a squeaky voice. We feel an almost constant conflict between what we want to do and what we think we should. Every hour of convincing exposition costs two or more of hesitant preparation. Sometimes our greatest acts, our greatest "testimonies," are nullified by reservations all too evident to the neutral onlooker. Taken altogether, we are, in short, somewhat *dutiful servants* of our Causes, but few of us are *joyous servants*.

If the undesirable consequences of being merely dutiful were confined to the strain on ourselves, or if they were necessary to our ends, the Cause would be worth the price. But far from bringing success to our efforts, tension always impedes, sometimes prevents. Service without joy is often barren, usually limited, seldom copied by others. The average devotee works alone, or with a small group, against a hostile world. But the happy worker multiplies his strength because his sense of desire and his sense of duty reinforce rather than hinder each other, and because he gains support and elicits aid from sources closed to the rest of us. His efforts seem to flow smoothly from an all-powerful inner logic. He seems, like all good salesmen, wholly free and humbly confident. Happy giving is unhesitating and wholehearted, uninhibited and unregretted. It is backed by untold and unknown resources of self-renewing energy. It is contagious; and when its time has come, it will be epidemic. The happy servant may not be distinguished by his wisdom, steadfastness, lack of misfortune, or by irrelevant satisfactions. But he seems almost invariably effective, marked by a dynamic relaxation which alone deserves the name of "peace."

ABE GOLDSTEIN.

Pacifism Defined

To the Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

In this crisis when we are threatened with the patterns of war being carried over into peacetime, should we not recognize that some of us have unduly narrowed the conception of "pacifist" and should broaden the meaning of the word? Long ago I learned that a pacifist—or should I say liberal pacifist?—may be defined as anyone who believes that war is neither inevitable nor desirable; while a militarist is anyone who believes that the war is either inevitable or desirable. According to this definition the whole population of any country may be divided into "pacifists" and "militarists."

There could of course be many shades of opinion in both groups, but certainly all pacifists would say that war is neither inevitable nor desirable. Most of them would probably say that it is out-of-date in our civilization as slavery was in 1860; and many would probably agree that it is as absurd to think that war can be gotten rid of by war as to think that slavery could be abolished by slavery. They want to work to get rid of the war system. Certainly these anti-militarists, if consistent, are "pacifists" in any reasonable meaning of the word.

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD.

Income Taxes

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I have become increasingly concerned about paying income taxes for war purposes. I understand that the early Friends often refused to pay taxes for purposes they considered wrong, and allowed their goods to be sold by the state. The argument that since the state would get the money in the end they might as well pay the tax in the first place apparently did not weigh with them. Do pacifists today feel that these early Friends were misguided, or do they feel that there is some significant difference in the present situation which makes this method unwise today?

Of course, I realize that since the withholding tax law was passed, the only way to avoid paying income taxes is to give up your job and practice voluntary poverty, keeping your earnings below the figure at which taxes begin. This would require for many persons an even more drastic sacrifice, probably, than having their goods sold.

But if the personal sacrifice were all that is involved in taking this action, it seems to me there would be at least a minority wing of the pacifist group willing to give up all and "follow him." I do know of one or two individuals who have taken this stand but not of any group.

HELEN H. CORSON.

Conscription Alternative

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I feel that I must write in appreciation of the recent FELLOWSHIP articles from *The Power of Non-violence*, by Richard Gregg. Mr. Gregg, to me, is the most convincing writer on the subject of pacifism that I have read. His book, more than any other document outside of the New Testament, forms the basis of my belief in pacifism as a means of living in harmony with one's neighbors.

The chief virtue of this book is expressed in the title in the word "Power." This is almost like saying "The Whiteness of Black" to the average person to whom the very name pacifist connotes weakness and powerlessness.

I like this idea of positive pacifism with its confident challenge to the proponents of force in human relationships. I like its scientific basis, its psychological insight, and its call to dangerous physical action.

At the Southern FOR Conference at Nashville in October, in a group discussion of conscription, I and some others suggested that we explore some "positive alternatives to conscription." Mr. Swomley, the group leader, took the view that we should not waste time "exploring alternatives" when none exist. Let us examine this view. In the first place, I do not see how being "against something" can be positive. In making this statement I do not mean to be merely quibbling over words. To put it in practical terms, those citizens who are supporting conscription are taking a positive stand. They are *for* military conscription to defend America. Now then, what are pacifists *for* to defend America? It seems to me that the only answer to this is non-violent action, soul force, or forgiving love, whichever you choose to call the principle of action so convincingly stated by Gregg.

RAYMOND HAMMOND.

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Louise Rounds, 1161 W. Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles 27, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 1418 Grape Street, Denver, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Prairie du Sac, Wis.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 7100 Kinsman Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.

A New Forerunners Studybook

CONSCRIPTION AFTER THE WAR?

By Harrop A. and Ruth S. Freeman

A right-up-to-date treatment of peacetime conscription, written to provide discussion material for young people, but we predict adults will find it most stimulating. A 64-page mine of ideas the world needs.

POCKET-SIZE **25c** ILLUSTRATED

Books in this series previously published:

PATTERN FOR PEACEMAKERS, Hassler
NEW WARS FOR OLD, Olmstead
EXIT EMPIRE, Nash
THE NEXT PEACE, Hassler

25c each — all 5 for $1.00

READY MARCH 20

Reflections of a Pastor in Occupied France

By Henri Roser

(Former French FOR Secretary)

A revelation of the thinking done by a sensitive, intelligent Christian under the Nazi occupation of France in the awful days of the autumn of 1941. A story of love and faith against hatred and despair.

With FOREWORD by ROSWELL P. BARNES and Biographical Sketch by JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

An Attractive Booklet **25c** An Inspiring Message

Read Wilfred Wellock's

A MECHANISTIC OR A HUMAN SOCIETY?

A fascinating discussion by a former member of the British Parliament who has decided that politics will never cure the evils of our over-industrialized society. On the basis of experience he urges decentralist theories.

With Foreword by Ralph A. Templin

First Printing in U. S. **25c** Stiff Paper Cover

Recent FOR Publications

The Power of Non-violence

Richard B. Gregg's classic of pacifism. Now in a revised edition with three new chapters. **$1.50**

Non-violence in an Aggressive World

A. J. Muste. As important now as before the war. New edition printed from original plates. **75c**

Christ and Our Enemies

Stephen Hobhouse. Introduction by Archbishop Temple. A challenge no Christian can ignore. **15c**

Towards a Christian Peace

Economic and political approaches to Christian peace by English authors, W. H. Marwick and Carl Heath. **25c**

Others You Should Not Miss

Prejudice **$3.00**
Carey McWilliams' comprehensive study of Japanese-Americans.

Freedom Road **2.75**
Howard Fast's powerful novel of Southern reconstruction.

Germany: A Short History **2.75**
Shuster & Bergstraesser. What happened in Germany and why.

In This Our Day **1.50**
Edith Lovejoy Pierce's first published volume of poetry.

From Victory to Peace **1.50**
Paul Hutchinson. Significant study of churches and peace.

Conscience and the State **1.00**
Julien Cornell's thoroughly up-to-date study of COs.

Anti-conscription Materials

Don't let down now in the fight to defeat peacetime conscription. Distribute our literature. Send for free list of all materials, then order what you need.

COMPLETE 50c PACKET

How to Conquer War —A FILM

World federation and peace, by Sydna White. A 45-minute illustrated lecture. 190 pictures on 35mm. film strip, plus mimeographed script. **$5.00**

Fellowship Publications

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION • 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.